UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,256	08/09/2005	Franck Abelard	PF020096	5624

24498 7590 04/02/2009

Robert D. Shedd
Thomson Licensing LLC
2 Independence Way
PRINCETON, NJ 08543-5312

EXAMINER	
FINDLEY, CHRISTOPHER G	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2621	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/02/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/522,256	ABELARD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHRISTOPHER FINDLEY	2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 January 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6 and 12-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6 and 12-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *1/25/2005*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. Claim 23 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 22. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 3, 6, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claim 3 draws its dependency from itself, which is indefinite.

5. Claim 6 recites the limitation "the commands stored in the first memory buffer are processed as a function of their order of storage in the said memory buffer" in lines 2-4 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim, since claim 3 does not recite a first memory buffer.

6. Claim 24 recites a device, yet draws its dependency from a method claim. These are different statutory categories, and such a combination is improper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-6 and 12-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chia-Wen Li et al.; "MPEG Video Streaming with VCR Functionality," IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology, vol. 11, no. 3, March 2001 (hereinafter referred to as "Li").

Re **claim 1**, Li discloses processing digital images, these images being transmitted from a server to a decoder using various modes of display (Lin: Fig. 7 illustrates transmission of MPEG-4 data between a server and a client device), images being coded once in a dependent manner such that the coding of a first image is used to code a second image (Lin: page 415, column 2, MPEG video compression is based on motion compensated predictive coding with an I-B-P frame structure), wherein, each image to be displayed together with the images of said once coded stream needed for its decoding constituting a group (Lin: page 415, column 2, MPEG includes Groups of Pictures (GOPs)), each group is transmitted from the server to the decoder after the others in the order of display (Lin: Fig. 7, the caption states that the MPEG-4 player displays video frames sent by the server according to the user's requests).

Re **claim 2**, Li discloses that the mode of display used by the decoder is transmitted to the server so that the server performs the transmission of the images as a function of the mode of display used by the decoder (Lin: Fig. 7, the VCR manager is located in the server).

Re **claim 3**, Li discloses that, when the server transmits coded images to the decoder, the server in parallel therewith transmits a command associated with each image comprising information allowing the decoder to process each image (Lin: Fig. 7, the IP network shown includes separate channels for user data flow and VCR control flow).

Re **claim 4**, Lin discloses several layers of transmission protocol that include browsing a content table, requesting video, RTSP server information, playback control, RTP video transport and RTCP for monitoring, wherein the server side is separated into a WEB server and a video server (Lin: Fig. 9).

Re **claim 5**, Li discloses that, when the terminal receives coded images and a command associated with each image, the command is transmitted to a first memory buffer while the coded images are transmitted to other memory buffers (Lin: Fig. 9, the server consists of a WEB server and a video server, wherein each of the WEB server and video server communicates in its own layer).

Re **claim 6**, Li discloses that the commands stored in the first memory buffer are processed as a function of their order of storage in the said memory buffer (Lin: Fig. 7, the caption states that the MPEG-4 player displays video frames sent by the server

according to the user's requests, wherein commands correspond to decoding and display operations).

Claim 12 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 6 above.

Claim 13 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 6 above.

Re **claim 14**, Li discloses that use is made of modes of display defined by a direction of display, that is to say the order in which images are displayed, as well as by a speed of display such that a variable number of images is displayed for one and the same processed group of images (Lin: page 418, column 2, last paragraph-page 420, column 1, paragraph 2, the VCR functionality includes changing display order).

Claim 15 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 14 above.

Claim 16 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 14 above.

Claim 17 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 14 above.

Claim 18 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 14 above.

Claim 19 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 14 above.

Claim 20 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 14 above.

Claim 21 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 14 above.

Re **claim 22**, Li discloses that when the decoder changes display mode, the size of the first memory buffer is reduced (Lin: page 415, column 2, paragraph 3, the

backward display mode requires immense memory resources, and therefore when backward display is enacted available memory resources are reduced).

Claim 23 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 22 above.

Claim 24 recites the corresponding device for implementing the method of claim 1, and therefore has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 1 above.

Claim 25 recites the corresponding computer program product comprising program code instructions for the execution of the steps of the method of processing digital images according to claim 1, and therefore has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 1 above.

Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER FINDLEY whose telephone number is (571)270-1199. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30 AM-5:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha D. Banks-Harold can be reached on 571-272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Marsha D. Banks-Harold/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621

/Christopher Findley/